# EXHIBIT A

#### Case 1:18-cv-10174-NMG Document 1-1 Filed 01/29/18 Page 2 of 10

(TO PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY: Please Circle Type of Action Involved: - TORT - MOTOR VEHICLE TORT CONTRACT - EQUITABLE RELIEF - OTHER.)

## COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

ESSEX, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT

Kimbery Steinhoff , Plaintiff(s)

Smith + Neyshew Endoscopy, Fre. , Defendant(s)

#### SUMMONS

To the above named Defendant: Smith + Newshew Endoscopy, Fire,

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon John Dans, Esq,

plaintiff's attorney, whose address is 350 park st, Park Place Suth, Six 105 North feeling, MA 01864

an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You are also required to file your answer to the complaint in the office of the Clerk of this court at 43 Appleton Way, Lawere, either before service upon plaintiff's attorney or within a reasonable time thereafter.

Unless otherwise provided by Rule 13 (a), your answer must state as a counterclaim any claim which you may have against the plaintiff which arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the plaintiff's claim or you will thereafter be barred from making such claim in any other action.

> WITNESS, Judith Fabricant, Esquire, at Salem, the , in the year of our Lord two thousand day of

NOTES:

NOTICE TO DEFINEAMY - You seed not appear parsonally in court to eastern life complaint, but if you claim to hare a defense, effer you or your

cibanej inist sena e copy of your writes enemer vithic 20 deys as specified herein and also the the criginal in the Cient's Office.

1. This summons is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure.

2. When more than one defendant is involved, the names of all defendants should appear in the caption. If a separate summons is used for each defendant, each should be addressed to the particular defendant.

### PROOF OF SERVICE OF PROCESS

the within sumn	tify and return that on nons, together with a copy of t e following manner (see Mass	the complaint in this a	ction, upon the within-na	
Dated:	, 20 .			
PLEASI	OCESS SERVER:- E PLACE <u>DATE</u> YOU MAK OX <u>ON THE ORIGINAL AI</u>			,
	·		, 20 .	

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

ESSEX, SS.

SUPERIOR COURT CIVIL ACTION No. 1777 CVO 1413

cly Steinhart Plaintiff(s) Smith + Newphew Enduscopp Defendant(s)

SUMMONS (Mass. R. Civ. P. 4)

ÇIVIL TRACKING ORDER (STANDING ORDER 1-88)	1777CV01913	Trial Court of Massachusetts The Superior Court	
CASE NAME: Kimberly Steinhoff vs. Smith & Newph	Thomas H. Driscoll, Jr., Clerk of Courts		
TO: John Davis, Esq. Davis & Davis, P.C. 350 Park St Park Place South Ste 105 North Reading, MA 01864		COURT NAME & ADDRESS Essex County Superior Court - Lawrence 43 Appleton Way Lawrence, MA 01841	

#### TRACKING ORDER - F - Fast Track

You are hereby notified that this case is on the track referenced above as per Superior Court Standing Order 1-88. The order requires that the various stages of litigation described below must be completed not later than the deadlines indicated.

#### **STAGES OF LITIGATION**

#### **DEADLINE**

	SERVED BY	FILED BY	HEARD BY
Service of process made and return filed with the Court		03/19/2018	Species and
Response to the complaint filed (also see MRCP 12)		04/17/2018	
All motions under MRCP 12, 19, and 20	04/17/2018	05/17/2018	06/18/2018
All motions under MRCP 15	04/17/2018	05/17/2018	06/18/2018
All discovery requests and depositions served and non-expert despositions completed	10/15/2018		
All motions under MRCP 56	11/13/2018	12/13/2018	
Final pre-trial conference held and/or firm trial date set			04/12/2019
Case shall be resolved and judgment shall issue by			12/18/2019

The final pre-trial deadline is <u>not the scheduled date of the conference</u>. You will be notified of that date at a later time. Counsel for plaintiff must serve this tracking order on defendant before the deadline for filing return of service. This case is assigned to

DATE ISSUED	ASSISTANT CLERK	PHONE
12/20/2017	Melissa Lewandowski	(978)242-1900

CIVIL	ACTION COVER SHEET	DOCKET NUMBER		Trial Court of Massachusetts The Superior Court	
PLAINTIFF(S):	Kimberly Steinhof			COUNTY	<u> </u>
ADDRESS:	16605 7th Ave E, Bradenton, Manatee County,	Florida 34212		Essex	
			DEFENDANT(S):	Smith & Newphew Endoscopy, Inc.	
ATTORNEY:	John W. Davis		-		<del>.</del>
ADDRESS:	Davis & Davis, P.C.		ADDRESS: 1	50 Minutaman Rd, Andover, Essex County, Massachusetts	
350 Park Street Par	rk Place Soulh, Ste. 105		<del>-</del>		
North Reading, Mas	ssachuselts 01864				—
8BO;	648399				
	TYPE OF A	ACTION AND TRACK	DESIGNATION (see	reverse side)	
CODE B22	Employment Discriminal		TRACK F	HAS A JURY CLAIM BEEN MADE?  YES NO	
f "Other" pleas	se describe:			***	
	STATEM	TENT OF DAMAGES P	URSUANT TO G.L.	c. 212. § 3A	
Documented in 1, Total 2. Total 3. Total 4. Total 5. Total 5. Total Documented for Reasonably ant Reasonably ant Reasonably ant torney Fees Briefly describe	redical expenses to date: hospital expenses doctor expenses chiropractic expenses physical therapy expenses st wages and compensation to date coperty damages to dated licipated future medical and hospital expensed litems of damages (describe below) plaintiff's injury, including the nature and hination and FMLA violation	(attach addiliona	T CLAIMS I sheets as necessary	\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$ Subtotal (A): \$\$  TBD	
		(attach additional shee			
ovide a detalled	description of claims(s):			TOTAL: \$	
	torney/Pro Se Plaintiff; X ONS: Please provide the case numb	In Visio Le er, case name, and	county of any relat	Date:  2/15//1 ed actions pending in the Superior Court.	7_
araby partific th	CERTIF	ICATION PURSUA	NT TO SJC RULE	1:18	
vantages and d	ng that I provide my clients with infol Ilsadvantages of the various method	rmation about court-	connected dispute.	urt Uniform Rules on Dispute Resolution (SJC resolution services and discuss with them the	
inature of Atto	orney of Record: X	Mair la		Date: 12//S//7	r

#### **COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

ESSEX, SS.	SUPERIOR COURT CIVIL ACTION NO.:
	)
KIMBERLY STEINHOFF,	)
Plaintiff,	)
	)
V.	)
	)
SMITH & NEWPHEW ENDOSCOPY, INC.	)
Defendant	)
	)
	•

#### COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

#### **Parties**

- 1. The plaintiff, Kimberly Steinhoff ("Ms. Steinhoff" or "Plaintiff"), is an individual with an address of 16605 7<sup>th</sup> Ave E, Bradenton, Manatee County, Florida 34212.
- 2. The Defendant, Smith & Newphew Endoscopy, Inc. ("the Company"), is a British-based corporation with a business location of 150 Minuteman Rd, Andover, Essex County, Massachusetts.

#### <u>Facts</u>

- 3. Ms. Steinhoff was employed by the Company as Finance Business Partner Manager.
- 4. Ms. Steinhoff worked out of the Company's Andover, Massachusetts location.
- 5. Ms. Steinhoff reported to Simon Allison, Finance Senior Director, who was based in the Andover, Massachusetts office.

- 6. Since starting in January 2015, Ms. Steinhoff consistently met and exceeded the Company's expectations. She was promoted in March 2017.
- 7. Ms. Steinhoff began maternity leave on or about May 30, 2017. Her maternity leave was scheduled to end August 21, 2017.
- 8. Soon thereafter, Ms. Steinhoff's husband received a job offer that would require the family's relocation to Florida.
- Ms. Steinhoff's initial request to work from Florida was approved. The approval
  made good business sense because Ms. Steinhoff would be closer to Al Kepler,
  the ENT Sales VP who she supported in Texas.
- 10. Without explanation, Ms. Steinhoff was notified that the Company's global CEO had vetoed the decision to allow Ms. Steinhoff to return to work in Florida after her maternity leave.
- 11. On July 25<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Allison notified Ms. Steinhoff that the Company would explore the possibility of a different, reduced role that focused on inventory. This position would have been a demotion, but the Company never followed through with this job offer.
- 12. On numerous occasions in which Company employees contacted the Plaintiff while she was on maternity leave, she explicitly communicated her desire to return to work after her maternity leave.
- 13. Mr. Chahine, the CFO, began interviewing candidates in the first week of July, while Ms. Steinhoff was on maternity leave.
- 14. In early August 8, HR employee Linda Portrum contacted Ms. Steinhoff while she was still on maternity leave, to request an exit interview.
- 15. Ms. Steinhoff told Ms. Portrum that she was ready, able and willing to return to work after her maternity leave. Ms. Portrum did not respond.

- 16. The Company has a history of allowing other employees, who did not take maternity or paternity leave, the opportunity to work remotely.
- 17. Rob Starr, a Senior Financial Analyst, who works in Andover, Massachusetts reports to a boss in Fort Worth, Texas. Mr. Starr supports managers across the country. Mr. Starr has been granted permission to work remotely from his home office on multiple occasions.
- 18. Megan Desfosses, a Senior Financial Analyst based in Andover, MA, reports to a boss in Fort Worth, Texas. She works at least one day per week from home. She provides support in FP&A activities for global HQ in the U.K.
- 19. Michelle-Lee MacInnis, a Project Manager, works at least 3 days per week from her home in Maine, and she comes to Andover office the other 2 days. She reports to a manager in Memphis, Tennessee.
- 20. Toni Conley, an Onboarding Specialist based in Andover, works at least 1-2 days per week from home, and also reports to a boss in Memphis. She supports people around the country, not focused in Andover, Massachuestts
- 21. Fina Alfe-Sindoni, the Senior Director of Events Coordination, works-full time remotely from her home in Atlanta, Georgia.
- 22. Kelly Westbrook, the Director of Trade Shows Planning, works full time remotely from her home in Florida and she reports to managers interspersed throughout the country.

#### **CAUSES OF ACTION**

#### COUNT I - Pregnancy Discrimination

- 23. This is a cause of action by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for pregnancy discrimination in violation of Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 151B, § 1, et. seq.
- 24. The Defendants chose to terminate the Plaintiff because of her childbirth and maternity leave.
- 25. On information and belief, the Company assumed that the Plaintiff would have more time to dote on her newborn baby if she was granted the opportunity to

work from home without a supervisor to monitor the amount of time spent with her baby.

- 26. On information and belief, the Company assumed that the Plaintiff would not be as dedicated based upon the fact that she would be working without supervision from her home.
- 27. As a direct result, the Plaintiff has suffered monetary damages.

#### **COUNT II - FMLA Violation**

- 28. This is a cause of action by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for violations of the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA).
- 29. The Company has violated the Plaintiff's substantive rights when it interfered with Plaintiffs FMLA rights to which the Plaintiff was entitled.
- 30. As a direct result, the Plaintiff has suffered damages.
- 31. The Company has also violated the Plaintiff's proscriptive rights, by retaliating against her for asserting this FMLA rights.
- 32. As a direct result, the Plaintiff has suffered damages.

The Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all triable issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Steinhoff,

By her attorney,

Dated: December 12, 2017

John W. Davis (BBO #648399)

Davis & Davis, P.C.

350 Park Street

Park Place South, Ste. 105

North Reading, Massachusetts 01864 (978) 276-0777 jdavis@davisanddavispc.com